

Buz Cory  
PO Box 1153, Cooper Sta.  
New York, NY 10276

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

[This is partly boilerplate (used because I could not word it better)  
and partly my own opinions].

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition  
to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them.  
As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will  
mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my  
computer.

This seems to be a repeat of the MPAA and affiliates ongoing war to  
control when and how US citizens view +all+ cinema and broadcast media.  
In particular, it seems to be a repeat of the attempt to stop consumers  
from recording broadcast TV on tape of years ago. Only this rule will  
have even greater impact than that as it will even prevent +any+  
reception of TV for many people.

In my own case, the +only+ way I can receive TV is by using open-code  
software. I have no hardware TV set and my computer runs only open-code  
software.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many  
users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers"  
who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant  
innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the

marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software.

It is my opinion that the only people that will benefit from this rule in the long run are the lawyers on both sides of the long and costly court battle that is sure to ensue if this rule is put into effect.

It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

~

Sincerely,

Buz Cory

2003-10-29 21:13:00 (GMT)  
16506181679 From

Wednesday, October 29 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

John Lotti  
1332 NE Carlabay Way #165  
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Wednesday, October 29 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Debra S. Bishop  
3835 16th Street  
Vero Beach, FL 32960

Wednesday, October 29 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content – I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

It is time for the government to take a strong stand in support of the individual consumer rather than big business.

Sincerely,

Ted Casey  
326 Maple Street  
San Francisco, CA 94118

2003-10-29 21:17:29 (GMT) 16506181679 From

Wednesday, October 29 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Mary Wrege  
613 concord way Prospect Hts.  
Prospect Heights, IL 60070

Page 1 of 1  
2003-10-29 21:16:29 (GMT)  
16506181679 From

Wednesday, October 29 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Michael Munro  
3224 E. Laurel Creek Road  
Belmont, CA 94002

Wednesday, October 29, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

William C. Billingsley  
8729 Edgehill Drive  
Huntsville, AL 35802

Wednesday, October 29, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Robert Prentiss  
13791 84th Place North  
Osseo, MN 55369

Robert Dotson  
1108 Dean Street #3b  
Brooklyn, NY 11216

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Robert Dotson

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

david tanner  
3942 pine tree drive  
Salt Lake City, UT 84124  
USA

JERRY HAMILTON  
5967 SPRING CROSSING  
SAN ANTONIO, TX 78247

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

As a broadcast television viewer and consumer of electronics and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am outraged that the FCC would consider a regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The broadcast flag is neither in my interest nor the public's interest. It will prevent me from watching digital broadcast television in the ways I currently enjoy analog broadcast television—for example, it will restrict my ability to move the video I have recorded for personal viewing from room-to-room and place-to-place.

The broadcast flag will also lock out my computer as a way to watch my favorite shows using my choice of software on a plane or train, or to send a television clip of a high school football game to family and friends.

Furthermore, if computers cannot freely receive digital television, how can I expect creative developers to discover new devices that enable me to use content in exciting ways I haven't even thought of? I value innovative devices like TiVo, ReplayTV and the Windows Media Center PC, which exist today because they were built to open standards using inexpensive, off-the-shelf computer parts.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital television equipment? A prettier picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and viewer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

JERRY HAMILTON

Christy Bainter  
124 Flanders Drive  
Warner Robins, GA 31093

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

As a broadcast television viewer and consumer of electronics and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am outraged that the FCC would consider a regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The broadcast flag is neither in my interest nor the public's interest. It will prevent me from watching digital broadcast television in the ways I currently enjoy analog broadcast television—for example, it will restrict my ability to move the video I have recorded for personal viewing from room-to-room and place-to-place

The broadcast flag will also lock out my computer as a way to watch my favorite shows using my choice of software on a plane or train, or to send a television clip of a high school football game to family and friends

Furthermore, if computers cannot freely receive digital television, how can I expect creative developers to discover new devices that enable me to use content in exciting ways I haven't even thought of? I value innovative devices like TiVo, ReplayTV and the Windows Media Center PC, which exist today because they were built to open standards using inexpensive, off-the-shelf computer parts.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital television equipment? A prettier picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and viewer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Christy Bainter

Tariq Aftab  
#2417, 16 'A' Main, 3rd Cross, HAL 2nd Stage,  
Indiranagar  
Bangalore, Karnataka, India 560008

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Tariq Aftab

Matthew T Emmett  
99 Tidemill Lane  
Apt 181  
Hampton VA 23666

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Matthew T Emmett

John Pruitt  
5415 Braesvalleyt, #784  
Houston, TX 77096

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

The decision to allow the broadcast flag will do far more harm than good.

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Furthermore, implementing the flag will not stop the main pirate of broadcast technology since they certain have the technical know-how to develop new ways to pirate the signals.

Sincerely,

John Pruitt

Jason Dusek  
615 N. Dubuque  
Iowa City, IA

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Jason Dusek

Mehul N. Sanghvi  
1271 Pawtucket Blvd  
Unit #3  
Lowell, MA. 01854

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Mehul N. Sanghvi

William H. Jackson  
262 Kristina Court  
Mascoutah, IL 62258

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

As a broadcast television viewer and consumer of electronics and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am outraged that the FCC would consider a regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The broadcast flag is neither in my interest nor the public's interest. It will prevent me from watching digital broadcast television in the ways I currently enjoy analog broadcast television—for example, it will restrict my ability to move the video I have recorded for personal viewing from room-to-room and place-to-place

The broadcast flag will also lock out my computer as a way to watch my favorite shows using my choice of software on a plane or train, or to send a television clip of a high school football game to family and friends. Living in the mid-west, I currently watch numerous baseball games on my computer that are broadcast through MLB.Com because they are not on television here in the St. Louis area. This "broadcast flag" could impede the way in which I access even pay services in my home area.

Furthermore, if computers cannot freely receive digital television, how can I expect creative developers to discover new devices that enable me to use content in exciting ways I haven't even thought of? I value innovative devices like TiVo, ReplayTV and the Windows Media Center PC, which exist today because they were built to open standards using inexpensive, off-the-shelf computer parts.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital television equipment? A prettier picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and viewer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

William H. Jackson

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

The proposed broadcast flag will not work.

The consumer is judge, jury, and executioner. Ask Circuit City and their former Divx product (Not the video codec)

I hope the MPAA is ready for backlash from the consumer electronics industry when no one buys the new items. There will be a major buying frenzy right before it's enforced, followed by complete silence. No one likes when freedom is taken away from them. Especially for a problem that doesn't exist.

Anyone who does not know about what is going on, will- the global Internet will alert them. There is always one person in each family that is "good with computers" and is sought out for information. The truth will be told of greedy corporate executives, followed by some choice curses. Thus, a sale will be stopped. The same way people are boycotting the RIAA (you think the latest low numbers are piracy?)

There will be hacks and cracks almost instantly if it gets passed.

Technology can not be stopped- greedy organizations need to evolve with the times, not launch pathetic attempts at controlling the consumer.

Sincerely,

Ed Martucci  
280 River Rd. #47B  
Piscataway, NJ 08854

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Richard Sajdak Jr.  
8815 Embassy  
Sterling Heights, MI 48313

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

The broadcast flag idea assumes that the majority of consumers are criminals. This is wrong and insulting.

Sincerely,

Tom Kinney  
2401 Highway 6 east 4212  
Iowa City, IA 52240

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content – I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Charles Powell  
2689 McGuffey Ct.,  
Woodbridge, VA 22191

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content – I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Jerome A. Solinas  
3105 Cardinal Drive  
Westminster, MD 21157

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Sean Jensen-Grey  
700 NW 42nd St, Suite 223  
Seattle, WA 98107